

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 7-23, 26, and 29-33 remain pending in the case. Claims 12-22 are allowed, while Claims 1-11 and 23-33 stand rejected. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 24, 25, 27, and 28 have been cancelled. Although Claims 1-11 and 23-33 have been amended herein, no new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the remarks set forth below.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication that Claims 12-22 are allowable. As such, Claims 12-22 are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 23-29, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0068800A1 by Fahmy et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Fahmy"). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 23-29, 31, and 32 are not anticipated by Fahmy for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1, as amended in this response, drawn to a double-high memory system compatible with termination schemes for single-high memory systems comprising (emphasis added):

an interface for input and output of data;
a plurality of memory units configured in two rows; and
a transmission line coupling said plurality of memory units to said interface,
wherein a double-high memory module is provided in a non-stacked arrangement, and
wherein said plurality of memory units is coupled together in a daisy chain configuration.

Independent Claim 23 recites limitations similar to those in Claim 1. Claims 4, 7-11, 26, and 29-33 depend from independent Claims 1 and 23, and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully assert that Fahmy does not teach, describe, or suggest a double-high memory system compatible with termination schemes for single-high memory systems “wherein said plurality of memory units is coupled together in a daisy chain configuration” as recited in independent Claim 1. The present Office Action directs Applicants to Figure 1 in Fahmy. Applicants respectfully assert that although Figure 1 may show two SDRAM coupled to a DIMM connector, it does not show two memory units coupled in a daisy chain configuration as claimed by Applicants. Moreover, by teaching SDRAM in a non-daisy chain configuration, Fahmy effectively teaches away from the claimed embodiments.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Fahmy, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of record. Since independent Claim 23 recites limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claim 1 is also not anticipated by Fahmy, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejections of record. Since Claims 4, 7-11, 26, and 29-33 depend from allowable base claims, Applicants respectfully assert that these dependent claims also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejections of record and are likewise allowable.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 8, 11, 30, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fahmy. Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 23-29, 31, and 32 are not rendered obvious by Fahmy for the following reasons.

The present Office Action states that the use of a 22 ohm resistor and a one inch transmission line, as recited in Claims 8, 11, 30, and 33, are obvious design choices. However, even assuming arguendo that these values are used with the invention taught in Fahmy, Fahmy still fails to teach, describe, or suggest a double-high memory system compatible with termination schemes for single-high memory systems “wherein said plurality of memory units is coupled together in a daisy chain configuration” as recited in independent Claims 1 and 23. Moreover, by teaching SDRAM in a non-daisy chain configuration, Fahmy effectively teaches away from the claimed embodiments. Consequently, Claims 8, 11, 30, and 33 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record as these claims depend from allowable independent Claims 1 and 23.


CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1, 4, 7-11, 23, 26, and 29-33 overcome the rejections of record. Also, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 12-22 are allowable given that they contain allowable subject matter as indicated in the present Office Action. Therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of all pending claims in the present application.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 12/27/05



John P. Wagner
Registration No. 35,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060